

**THE MIMETIC MODEL
IN PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHOTHERAPY**

1. Introductory remarks

1. I would like very much that this really is a workshop, a place in which we together try to learn from each other. The workshop is about mimesis and the possibilities the knowledge of the mimetic model gives in the psychological and psychotherapeutic field. Of course now already we are in the mimesis with each other. The big point is, if we are in the mimesis with each other in freedom, or if we are already rivalling. Only in the first case we can learn from each other. Thus this workshop is not about who is right and who is wrong. We tell each other, hopefully, insights, experiences, in order to deepen our knowledge and our psychotherapeutic possibilities. We can only really learn in model-model relationships, in which no rivalling is around, in which we respect everybody, with her or his knowledge and intuitions.

We are sitting in a circle, able to see each other as complete as possible. We are communicating with each other as whole persons, in a sense with all the possibilities, aspects, all the cells of our being. We are in fact communicating the whole of who we existentially are. Being wholly in the mimesis with each other, the mimesis always coming before our reflection, we register very much of each other, not only with our senses, but even on deeper levels, more than we ever can acknowledge. We too react on each other mimetically, very often without acknowledging it.

Of course, in order to understand, we need words. In the same time, using words, we tell more than only our words. Our words are illustrated by the whole of our existence. This both is true when we are telling about ourselves and when we tell about others, about "cases". Even when we tell about others, we tell what we actually don't know ourselves. Just because this is the case, we often understand, carefully listening, more than what is consciously told to us. Thus we hear the secret of the story. Everything told to us has mythical aspects, is in a sense myth, is build on a secret or on secrets. Carefully listening the secret might be unveiled and thus there is a possibility for life to change.

We learn best when the distance between us is optimal and the relationship is personal. That only is the case, when we clearly see each of us as single persons and we never see some of us or the rest of us as a crowd. As soon as there is a crowd, there too is a scapegoat. Thus we always see each of us separately, personally. We really talk only to a person. When two of us are talking to each other, we all direct our attention towards them, carefully listening, forgetting the surroundings and our own interests.

In order to make that better possible, I would like that we begin now by making two "rounds":

In the first one we tell who we are, and a little bit of our background.

In the second one we tell what brings us here: Which are our interests? Which are the questions we have already about the theme.

Of course in this manner I am already talking about the foundations of group work in the Girardian style. Consequently we are already deeply in our theme.

A. CULTURAL 'NORMALITY'

1. Humanity is a new creation, in which we left instincts, drives behind us
2. Everybody is in the mimesis with everybody and everything around
3. We are and we know about ourselves only in relationships
4. Temporal and spatial mimesis
5. All relations are always triangulated
6. Humans are, as such, always second, never first
7. Humans need to have being
8. Culture and human life are kept going on by rituals, prohibitions and myths
9. Culture is a self-regulating reality
10. Culture and human life are founded on secrets
11. The inevitability and the possibility to change

A1. Humanity is a new creation, in which we left instincts, drives, behind us

Humanity came into existence, just because it had to, out of an emergency. The dominance patterns did not any longer do. The instincts, the drives, did not any longer bring order, but havoc. We had to leave them behind us. And thus, although of course we have very much in common with animals, with the totality of being, we are totaliter aliter. We are defined by culture, by what once was made possible as a new manner of living together.

This means:

1. (positively) Humanity is a new creation, a reality unheard of before. In that sense the theological thinkers of the Old Testament were certainly right. We are, and only are defined by interpersonal history.
2. (negatively) Humanity left drives and instincts behind itself. Human existence is wholly defined by culture, by human interactions. We cannot go behind our origin and its consequences. We will never understand animals. We will never be able to go back behind our originary scene, with theories about human drives and instincts, which only can be expressed in language, which originates from that scene which changed everything. Trying to talk about human drives and instincts is paradoxical.

For psychotherapy this means, that it has nothing to do with drives and instincts. All the phantasies about them we can leave behind us.

Humanity is a new creation. In becoming human we left instincts, drives, behind us. We are only human, defined by interpersonal history.

A2. Everybody always is in the mimesis with everybody and with everything around

We never cannot be in mimesis. It belongs to existing to be in mimesis. This probably is the case for everything which exists as well as for everybody. It is the mimesis of desire, the mimesis to have, finally the desire to be.

This mimesis of desire looks like a drive: It works before we think and very often without our thinking at all. It has power over us, although often we don't wish so. But here is a misunderstanding. Not the mimesis has power over us. The other, the Other has. The power over us does not come from inside, from our "mimetic nature", but from outside, from those who are around us, in which manner ever.

The emergence of culture became necessary because the mimesis of desire of the proto-humans became too strong to be regulated by the dominance patterns. Aristotle already knew that humans are the most mimetic of all animals. Because of that, order broke down and the proto-humans lost their being.

Culture gave, and still gives, another possibility to cope with the mimesis of desire. It made and makes human life possible by preventing that humans disappeared into chaos and it gave and gives humans a sense of being.

A psychotherapist is always in the mimesis with his so-called client as well, as the client is with him. The therapist never can be outside of it, standing "above it" or standing "above" the client. Standing "above" means that we try to win in a rivalry.

**Everybody always is in the mimesis of desire with everybody and everything around.
Culture made it possible to live together and to have being.**

A3. We are and know about ourselves only in relationships.

Culture brought humans, out of the mechanisms of dominance patterns, into relationships. These are typical and foundational for humanity, for human existence. We all became and become human in our own, unrepeatable manner, we too change, only in and through relationships. Equally we know about our being and about our consciousness only in and because of relationships. The centre of our existence is not, as we always think or assume, in us, in our heart or wherever, but between us.

The ordering of human relationships, in which there always is a measure of freedom, presupposed language, the possibility to make concepts, the possibility to order relationships in a conscious manner. Culture, humanity and language are coeval. No humanity is thinkable without language.

Relationships and language form the realm of the spiritual, the only truly human aspect of reality. The spiritual is between us, as for the creed of the church the Holy Spirit is between the Father and the Son.

The spiritual reality includes responsibility, for each other, for everybody and everything around us. Humanity and the ethical, morality, are coeval. It is not an extra which we acquired later and which we eventually can shed again.

For psychotherapy this means:

1. Human change is only possible when human relations change
2. In psychotherapy the relation between "client" and therapist is deciding
3. There cannot be therapy without language and mutual responsibility
4. Psychotherapy is a misleading word because it is not about the psyche, but about relationships

We are and we know about ourselves only in relationships. We are spiritual beings. For human relationships language and responsibility are foundational.

A4. Temporal and spatial mimesis

Every human has a history as old as the world itself and is, till in his very cells, absolutely unique. S/he has in her/himself the results of all the experiences of the ancestry, which are given on through the generations in temporal mimesis.

From the conception on, we begin our spatial mimesis with our future mother. After our birth we come into constant spatial mimesis with the world around us, which is gradually widening. In the same time in temporal mimesis we repeat and store what we learned.

Consequently we all are extremely complicated and in the same time is each of us unique. It is and will always remain totally impossible that we can know "everything" about ourselves. In fact we only observe experiences, of difficulties and happiness, as soon as they become more complicated in most of the cases not really knowing what caused them.

For psychotherapy this means: All humans are always extremely complicated and we never can assume that we can wholly know them. We only can understand or try to understand aspects of the actual relationships somebody is in, spatial relationships which have to do with temporal ones. Not persons, only aspects of relationships can be seen and eventually understood.

All humans are unique, the result of temporal and spatial mimesis. A human never can be really known. Only aspects of relationships can be understood.

A5. All relations are always triangulated

Existence always is, probably in many manners in the same time, triangulated. All relationships have the form of a triangle: Two animals with a piece of food etc. Human existence is triangulated in an own manner. The third corner is, in some manner, always transcendent. Originally it is the triangulation with a god, a devil-god (Girard), with a hunted but because of the tensions in the group untouchable animal (Gans). The triangulation of all human relationships with transcendence, with a reality which is above us, out of our reach, is the founding happening of culture.

As long as we are human, living and acting inside of culture, we always are, more or less, in some manner triangulated. If transcendence wholly disappears out of the triangulation, or better if transcendence seems to come within our reach, only money, or being, which we both desire, becomes the third point in the relationship, we become doubles of each other and in the end we destroy each other.

It belongs to human responsibility to live in a triangulation in which there is some form or transcendence. As soon as we forget that, as we are prone to do in a wholly secularised culture, we are both endangering culture and our personal life.

The responsibility of the psychotherapist is twofold:

1. He has to know about the triangulation with transcendence as a condition of human existence and of his own triangulation, both as a person and as a therapist, and
2. He is, eventually in different manners, responsible for the triangulations in the life of the client

Structures always had the form of triangles. They were, and are, prolongations of the original personal triangles in the founding happening.

All life is triangulated. All human life is, in some manner, triangulated with transcendence.

A6. Humans are, as such, always second, never first.

Humanity came when everything else was already there. It is wholly dependent on its pre-existing surroundings. Humanity is second. This is true as well for everybody individually. The whole always was and is first. We are always second, and reacting. Thus we only can be humble. Humility belongs to the human condition.

This is reflected in the mimesis. In mimesis, which goes before thinking, we are reacting before we are conscious of it, if we ever become conscious at all.

Culture took care, with structure, that we could not forget that we are second, that we had, and stuck to, our place. When we leave structure behind us, leave in fact transcendence behind us, we lose our place and we try to become first, which is the origin of illness.

This is true for the therapist as well. He too is always second and never first. He too cannot live and do his work without humility.

Humans always are second, never first. When they try to turn that around, to become first, they fall in some manner ill.

A7. Humans need to have being

Animals have their place and thus, probably, their sense of being, because they have their place in the dominance patterns. We lost this possibility together with these patterns. Consequently culture has to give us a place and thus the knowing that we are.

Culture took care of that by giving humans a place under transcendence, in structure, both macro and micro. It was a very own place which could not be taken away, in society as a whole, in the profession, in the family and everywhere. Having this place gave being and, within the rules, restrictions and prohibitions of culture, freedom to act.

Because of the disintegration of the structures we lose and lost our place, our being, and thus our freedom. All desire nowadays is desire to be, metaphysical desire, the desire to have being in and out of ourselves, the desire to be gods. Consequently freedom now means that we are like gods, able to do everything we wish to do.

The same is true for the therapist: Without a place, given to him by culture, he misses the freedom he needs to do his work. In that case he necessarily rivals with the client, finally for being, and destroys both the client and his work.

Humans cannot live without being. They either have being, living in structures under transcendence, or they are enslaved by metaphysical desire.

A8. Culture and personal life are kept going on by rituals, prohibitions and myths

Cultural life is a “system” which is kept going on by: 1. Rituals, which prescribe what has to be done and with the help of which scapegoats are driven out. 2. Prohibitions, which prevent that chaos destroys culture. 3. Myths, the founding stories of culture, in which culture finds its identity and in which it hides its victims.

All these aspects are present in all cultural activities, not only in the religious ones, but too in the artistic and in all scientific ones.

This equally is the case with the life of every single human person. Her/his life too only can go on with the presence in her/his life of rituals, prohibitions and myths. If one of them, or all of them, disappear(s), human life is destroyed.

For therapy that can mean that rituals, prohibitions and myths, as the reintroduction of structure, are used in the healing (or curing) process.

No human life is possible without rituals, prohibitions and myths

A9. Culture and human life are self regulating realities

Human culture came when it was necessary, in a deep sense out of the blue. Mimesis always is before consciousness. Thus culture came before consciousness. The regulating realities, rituals, prohibitions, myths, structures, which made human life possible, they all just came, out of the experiences, without thinking, without strategies.

We still have remnants of all this, in the more personal circles of life. We have it in a curious manner in sport and in some other areas, but it is everywhere disintegrating. The old prohibitions, e.g. to honour your father and our mother, are often even not any longer understood.

The disintegration of culture began the very moment of its coming into existence. Initially it went very slowly. The first deep, self-regulated change came in Athens in the Vth century BC. The second one, of paramount interest for our existence, originates from the Middle Ages and became final in the XVIIth century. Before that last change transcendence, the sacred, was central, humans clearly were secondary. Descartes turned it around. Humans became central, *res cogitans*, deciding, all the rest became *res extensa*, just things. Since then humans are not any longer part of the whole. They all built the whole up around themselves. We don't accept any longer that we are second. We all now wish to be the centre of the world, the first, sacred, god her- or himself.

Changes in culture happened because they were necessary. Humans lost their place in the whole because culture disintegrated. Modern science, technology became necessary in order to keep human life, culture going. Paradoxically we now are destroying all life and thus culture itself by exactly the means we devised in a pre-rational process in order to save it.

Every human being is a self regulating reality as well. As long as s/he does not fall ill, life goes on of itself. Every human partakes in the self regulating process of culture and falls ill together with culture. Thus still self regulating is the biggest part of our life. There still is some transcendence, some external mediation, but on the whole we now all are virtual victims of each other, all possessed by metaphysical desire, fighting to win, in order to have being. We all are now in the realm of the Other, of illness.

The therapist has to know that he is in this madhouse as everybody else, and that he rivals with his colleagues and with his clients, with the whole world if he does not have freedom from somewhere.

Culture, and in culture humans, are self regulating realities. Because of the disintegration of culture this self regulation is seriously endangered.

A10. Culture and human life are founded on secrets.

Culture and human life, participating in culture, are both founded on secrets: The secret that culture came into existence and goes on to exist at the costs of scapegoats, randomly chosen people, animals and objects, realities of any sort, who carry the violence, the difficulties, the responsibility of those who participate in culture and keep culture going. Consequently, it is a fiction that there are inherently both good people and bad people.

Because culture and human life are built on secrets, human life in culture is not possible without secrets.

Culture and the life of all of us is hypocritical, both objectively and, more and more, subjectively: Vaguely we begin to understand that we fabricate our scapegoats, that they are innocent.

The very fact that culture is breaking down has serious consequences:

- Because we understand better what we are doing when we are scapegoating and nevertheless need scapegoats, we hide better than ever that we are scapegoating. Our scapegoats are not only the traditional "bad people", criminals and the like, but all those unhappy people around us: The not-adjusted people, the (mentally) ill, the victims of the traffic, all the people who are hungry and unhappy, who are murdered and maimed innocently all over the world.
- Because structures are dwindling and order is wrecking down we need more scapegoats than ever.
- Consequently secrets are spreading, especially dysfunctional secrets, which make ill.

The therapist is first of all a participant in culture, living from scapegoats as we all do. Secondly, he makes a living out of working with these scapegoats, who are, by so-called caring professions all too often (secretly!) scapegoated again, thus scapegoated to the square, buried under a double secret. He only can do his work when he knows that the client is worth as much as he does and that he is, for his part, responsible for his suffering.

Human life in culture is not possible without secrets, thus without hypocrisy. Secrets make life both possible and ill.

A11. The inevitability and the possibility to change

Because of the millennia of temporal mimesis we are in, we all are extremely complicated beings. Nevertheless, any time we are in spatial mimesis, when mimetic influences from outside come to us, we change, mostly very little, but nevertheless. Changes of our life always are, first of all, changes in relationships. Changes in our inner household, in our "soul", are secondary.

Generally the changes are not life-changing as such. They are changes inside of the system of equilibria in which we live. There only is a real change of our life, when freedom, or a measure of freedom, comes into it. This freedom reorders our relationships. Meeting with freedom can be all-overturning, as the so-called miracles of Jesus, and e.g. spontaneous remissions of cancer show. Mostly however they are very important for us, but nevertheless of a smaller scale.

For therapists this means: They always have to do with people who anyway are very complicated and who they certainly cannot change by manipulating their feelings. They only can meet them in freedom, giving "the client" the possibility of an experience of freedom which comes to him and of which he generally does not know. This freedom eventually gives him the possibility to go new ways in his life.

For humans to change is both inevitable and possible

B. ILLNESS

1. Falling ill means that the Other comes into us
2. The figures of the mimesis of desire
3. All unfree relationships are fascinations
4. The soul is the product of unfree relationships
5. The psychological and psycho-pathological patterns
6. Illness and secrets

B1. Falling ill means that the Other comes into us

Falling ill is the result of unfreedom, which overwhelms us, which is, mimetically, given to us in the relationships we are in. The Other overpowered us, brought his, in fact their difficulties, their violence and so on, in us. We become possessed. We first become excited or depressed or whatever and in the end we fall ill.

We fall ill as a whole person, with all the aspects of our being. When we become psychically ill, it still is clear that the illness is caused by the relationships we were and are in. When the illness is a physical one, the relationships which provoked it, are much deeper hidden. But in that case too the illness is provoked by the Other in us. In both cases mostly or always there is both temporal and spatial mimeses.

All illnesses are mental, caused by relationships. We can distinguish them, but not separate them, in (mostly) physical and (mostly) psychical illnesses. All illnesses are bio-psychosocial (Engel), but then better the other way round: Socio-psycho-biological.

Falling ill means that we are a victim, a sacrificial victim, of the Other, of everybody and everything around us. In a deep sense nowadays, when we fall ill, we have had bad luck. We fought, as everybody around us and with us does, to be first and thus to escape and we lost. Illnesses finally always are the result of, generally unconscious, cultural strategies of the Other. Culture needs scapegoats and again and again takes care to produce them.

The nuns of Loudun, so beautifully described by J.M. Gougeon, in *Un mime nimm_d_sir*, 105ff, fought like mad and were in the same time, finally, the victims, the scapegoats, of the citizens of that town.

Falling ill always means to be a victim of the Other, of all around us, to have lost in the fight for being and to be scapegoated.

B2. The figures of the mimesis of desire

The Other comes into us because of our rivalling. When we rival with each other, we have in the same time two, opposite, goals: To be the first, the sacred, god, to have being, and, the reverse, to prevent that we are the last, that we end up as the scapegoat and eventually ill.

When structure, and with it model-model-relationships disappear, we come in skewed external mediation and, finally, in internal mediation, in which we all are at each other's mercy. This explains the atmosphere of constant anxiety, in which we all nowadays live, the anxiety to lose in the fight of life, to be scapegoated.

In the internal mediation we are in model-rival- and model-obstacle-relationships, mostly in many of them in the same time, winning and losing. As long as we can maintain a certain equilibrium without using up all our possibilities, as long as we remain with a certain ease in the middle, amongst "average people", we are "adapted". As soon as we are nearing the extremes, of "up" and "down", we are endangered.

Not all our relationships have the same force over our life. The bigger the force of the mimesis, the bigger both the possibilities and the risks. Newton's law is the general law for all and not only for human mimesis.

For a therapist it is necessary to know that he is very important for the client, that his mass is very big and that he is, in the same time, very near. If he is free with the client, he can live this importance to the benefit of the client. If he is unfree, in the end it always is harmful, even when he means well.

We are endangered when the world of our relationships becomes "solid" in a manner, when we are "frozen", both in the one-up and, simultaneously in the one-down position, or the other way round, when we can't any longer move. If that does last long enough, we fall in some manner ill.

We fall ill when we get stuck in model-rival- and model-obstacle-relationships, the force of which is defined by Newton's Law

B3. All unfree relationships are fascinations

All relationships are reciprocal. In structure they have a certain amount of freedom. Outside of structure they are for all people involved unfree. All relationships get the character of fascinations. This means that they all have a positive and a negative side, people being attracted by each other and afraid of each other.

Although in unfree relationships all are fascinated, the power of the fascination is not the same for each. This power is inversely proportional to the mass of each.

Fascinations always are experienced as feelings: Of being in love, happy or unhappy, of being jealous, being enthusiastic, of being angry or fearful. In a fascination, thus in all unfree relationships, the feelings of the people involved need not be the same. They can and often are the opposites of each other, both in the different people involved and in the same person in different times.

In an unfree relationship the therapist is fascinated by the "client" as the latter is by him. The lack of freedom can be expressed in a very innocent manner: "An interesting case." "I like this client." "Her husband is a bad man!" "I have to handle this case well, because there is an article in it." To repeat it in Freudian words: There is no transference without a counter-transference. Both are fascinations.

Relationships in skewed external mediation and in internal mediation always are fascinations, are, consequently, always double binds.

B4. The soul is the result, the product of unfree relationships

In the modern meaning the soul is the origin and container of all feelings of happiness and of achievement and of all feelings of unhappiness and misery. It is the result of all the unfree relationships we were and are in, in skewed external mediation and in internal mediation, in which the Other came into me. My soul, the totality of my feelings, they are the others, the ones over whom I won and over whom I lost. It is the origin of all illness.

My soul is not my very most me, as modern misunderstanding assumes. My soul is the reflection, the acknowledgment in me, of the power of the Other over me. The whole of my feelings is the result of all the adventures I had in skewed external and in internal mediation.

Freedom, which always is given to us, which we never can acquire, is part, an aspect of our existence, of our being. Unfreedom, the Other in us, the result of our rivalling relationships, manifests itself in our soul and in our physical illness.

This means that a psychotherapist who is busy with the soul of the "client", who tries to work with his feelings, is only working symptomatically. He might cure in a sense, making life a little bit more bearable. He will not heal. He does in fact not even know what healing, the bringing back in free relationships, is.

The soul is, as all illnesses, the result, the deposit of unfree relationships.

B5. The psychological and psycho-pathological patterns

We become who we are and our psychological and psychopathological patterns become as they are as a result of relationships, in temporal and spatial mimesis. They never are inborn and unchangeable, although the experiences and thus influences of the ancestry are given on in our cells.

This is true for our moods, for our being optimistic in our life, or pessimistic, easy living or taking everything heavy.

It is equally true for all the psycho-analytical “drives”: For the so-called Oedipus-complex, for sado-masochism, for homosexuality and so-called pseudo-homosexuality, for death-instincts, for hypochondria, generally for all these “drives” which psycho-analysis tries to explain by making ontological realities out of symptoms, out of the results of relationships.

It is equally true for all forms of neurosis and psychosis:

In neurosis there still is a clear difference for me between me and the other. In psychosis this difference between me and the other is not any longer clear.

1. The model-rival-relationship, with external mediation and a skewed transcendence. In neurosis: Narcissism. In psychosis: Megalomania.

2. The model-rival-relationship, with internal mediation. In neurosis: Hysteria, in psychosis: Psychosis.

3. The model-obstacle-relationship. In neurosis: Obsessive-compulsive neurosis, in psychosis: Schizophrenia.

All psychological and psychopathological patterns are the result of relationships.

B6. Illness and secrets

Culture and life are both built on secrets. In the world of the mimesis of desire cultural life is not possible without secrets. In a deep sense, we cannot face reality, we cannot face ourselves. We, and culture, would be destroyed by it. Only in a world of mimesis outside of desire the secrets would be away.

The final secret always is that we refuse to carry our responsibility, that we are hypocritical. Any time we take our responsibility upon us, the secret becomes less "heavy". Life becomes more clear, less ill.

Nevertheless, in culture, there are functional and dysfunctional secrets. Secrets which make it possible that culture and that the life of each in culture goes on, are functional. Secrets which make ill, are dysfunctional. A complication is that a functional secret for one is often, if not always, a dysfunctional one for the other. A scapegoating-process is, or at least might be functional for the scapegoaters. In the same time it is dysfunctional for the scapegoat. Secrets are, as everything else, not in, but always between us.

Behind illness first of all there is the secret that we are scapegoated and thus fell ill. Here rises the constant question: Why just I? Why did God (= Why did the mob[!])? By putting the question in this manner we are already protecting the secret. We are hiding the responsibility of humanity as a whole and of the people around us as well as our own.

Behind every illness there is a secret or there are secrets, which made us ill and which makes it eventually impossible for us to heal. This is true both for psychical and for psychical illness. Very often it is possible to trace this responsibility, both of those who, finally, made ill and of the ill person her/himself...

Examples:

The school-boy in Wesel. He fell out of his illness when the secret was unveiled.
The father who refused to see his dying child, refusing the own responsibility. The husband, who loved his daughter better than his wife, making her ill.

Just as culture itself, illnesses are founded on secrets with which we hide our responsibility

C. HEALING

1. Healing is in the meeting
2. The newness of the meeting
3. What is healing?
4. In healing there is no scapegoating
5. The authority of the healer
6. Accepting healing

C1. Healing is in the meeting

Healing is to be delivered from relationships which imprisoned, which made ill, into a new reality, into freedom or, at least, less unfreedom. Healing only is possible in relationships, in spatial mimesis.

Healing happens because a new reality comes in the life of the ill person. It is the really unexpected. Generally we know everything we expect and if we don't know, we are afraid. We repeat time and again the same, in an eternal routine. In the meeting with the unexpected healing occurs and, the other way round, healing occurs when we meet the unexpected.

This means: Not every meeting is a meeting in the real sense. Most meetings are routine, ritual, reaffirming the situation, reaffirming what we knew already, confirming the old situation. Real meeting always is outside of the routine, out of ritual. It breaks the old world open. It is a meeting from "the other side", "the other world".

Healing only happens when a new reality comes, or when new realities come into our life.

C2. The newness of the meeting

It is worthwhile to try to understand better what exactly the newness of the meeting is.

- It is unexpected. We don't know in advance if it will happen and what exactly happens. It just comes over us.
- It wholly comes from outside, as if from an unknown world. In advance we did not know about the existence of this reality.
- It is a meeting in which freedom is given to us, a freedom which mimetically becomes the freedom of the ill person.
- It is a meeting, in fact, not only of two persons, but of two worlds. In the meeting the ill person gets out of an old and comes into a new triangulation, the triangulation of the "healer". The "healer" lives in a triangulation which gives him/her freedom. Thus the healer brings the ill person in his world, in another reality, with a new triangulation, a new transcendence.

It is important and of course not fortuitous, that the Greek θεραπεύω means: To take care of a person, to serve, to nurse, to heal, and, in the same time: To serve the gods. There is in fact no healing without this triangulation.

- This meeting is only possible when there are no conditions or presuppositions, either cultural or personal, when the healer fully accepts the ill person in her/his life. All cultural qualifications: Good – bad, sympathetic – not sympathetic, beautiful – ugly, interesting – dull, intelligent – stupid etc fall away. It is a meeting as equals, without any scapegoating. The ill person is taken earnest without any condition. The healer knows about humility, about innocence.
- In the meeting the people who meet are really together. The rest of the world falls away. There are no second thoughts of whatever sort.

This/These reality/realities is/are brought into the life of the ill person by meeting with somebody who is free with us.

C3. What is healing?

Healing means that we are delivered, out of relationships which made us unfree, by and into relationships which make us free and which change the relationships we are in.

When there is healing, the soul and the body heal in the same time. The other loses its power over us, over our being, disappears out of us, without leaving traces, as if he never was in us. Our body and soul are cleansed. We become free.

Healing means that we come into a new world. The old world of imprisonment falls away and we are brought, "transferred", into a new one. The ill person is moved, out of the old triangle of slavery, in which the scapegoating gods were, the sacred was almighty, into the triangle with the healer, in which transcendence gives freedom, a new life.

In curing the ill person is treated as if he is an isolated person, even if he is treated together with people who are surrounding him. He stays in his old world. In healing there is not first of all the treatment of an isolated person ill, but there is first of all the meeting with its consequences. In the new context, of course, treatment might be useful.

Healing means that we are cleansed, that the Other, who made us ill, disappears out of our being, out of our soul.

C4. In healing there is no scapegoating

It was scapegoating which made ill. We always try to prevent illness and to get rid of illness by winning, by scapegoating others. Psychotherapy is very often, if not mainly, a strategy to scapegoat others for the illness of the "patient", if it is not scapegoating of the "patient" her/himself. Scapegoating in medical or psychotherapeutical treatment is going on with the illness with old means.

Curing is a scapegoating-process. The ill person is not seen in the context, but taken earnest as a scapegoat, thus reinforcing the cultural process which made ill. The intruders, physical or psychological, symptoms, representatives of the Other are indentified as the guilty ones and driven out or killed. The secret of the Other remains hidden.

In healing the ill person is not isolated but brought into a new world. Being a scapegoat, a victim, and thus not primarily responsible for the situation s/he is in, s/he gets thus the possibility to take the responsibility for her/his situation and change it. Being changed in the healing, s/he is able to change the relationships s/he is in. In the scapegoating the Other lies his responsibility for the relationships upon the scapegoat. The scapegoat accepts it mimetically, "masochistically". Healed s/he accepts the responsibility for the relationships and brings them in a new, not-scapegoating reality.

Healing sets in every sense free from the scapegoating-mechanisms which are the very cause of the illness. In the healing the ill person is changed from a so-called victim into somebody who is and accepts his/her responsibility for the relationships he/she is in. In the new triangulation of freedom, responsibility can be acknowledged and accepted.

In the healing, scapegoating, by the Other of me, by me of the Other, is overcome.

f

Freedom and authority belong together. In a very deep sense they are one. There is no authority without freedom and no freedom without real authority. This authority does not mean to have power or, worse still, to use it. Although, or maybe just because, the healer has this authority, the ill person always remains him/herself responsible for her/his life and for the decisions they take about their life. Authority, freedom and humility belong together. They are aspects of one spiritual reality.

Freedom and authority are given when we live under (a) transcendence. They deepen, the more the healer knows about the mimetic model and its consequences in the relationships of people and thus in the life of each of us. This knowledge is not an intellectual knowledge or, at least, not only an intellectual knowledge. It first of all is an existential one. As far as this is the case, freedom and authority are growing in him. He learns to "see" reality around and in front of him, both the macro and the micro, with "eyes", informed by the free wisdom of the existentially knowing of the model.

In this freedom the healer really can listen. He does not interfere in any manner with his own feelings or reactions. He listens, with his ears, his eyes and his being. He hears, what the other is saying, very often without knowing what he is saying. What the healer hears gets a new reality, a new meaning in his own being. He sees another reality, hears the secrets. This is happening in him, in an intuitive understanding.

In this freedom and authority, which never is without humility, he can tell the ill person what he hears, reordering what is told. He can put unexpected questions. Finally, he always, in one manner or another, eventually unknowingly, unveils (the) secret(s) on which the illness is built.

It might be clear that all this is about existentiality, not about professionalism. A professional (psycho-) therapist, who probably had to unlearn very much of what he once learnt, may be a gifted healer. He may as well for ever be unable or not willing to unlearn and remain a curer. A non-professional on the other hand, who knows, has the freedom and thus the authority and the humility, might be a gifted healer.

Who heals, heals by her/his freedom and authority and with the help of her/his, conscious and unconscious, knowledge of the mimetic model.

C6. The acceptance of healing

Healing must be accepted. We never are healed outside of our own responsibility. To accept to be healed is an act of freedom exactly as it is an act of freedom to be a healer in authority and humility. To accept to be healed is an act of humility, as it is an act of humility to be a healer. Healer and healed are in this sense parallel.

When we cure the ill person can be treated as a thing. In healing that is impossible. Healing only is possible when healer and healed both finally accept their responsibility. Healing deepens the freedom of the ill person in the very act, instead of eliminating it.

We are healed when we accept the unveiling of our secret, the secret which finally always gave us the possibility to evade responsibility, which we kept hidden, mostly even unknowingly, to prevent that we would be ashamed. The unveiling of the secret is the task of the healer. The unveiling of a secret is a δκανδαλον. A δκανδαλον always enforces upon us to choose: Either we accept it, and we are healed, or we reject it and we remain the same. If we are too afraid of the truth, we love our secret too much. Consequently we are not able to accept our responsibility and we remain ill.

There is here a striking and of course not fortuitous parallel between δκανδαλον and φαρμακον. They both can heal and destroy.

The accepting of the unveiling of the secret, of the δκανδαλον, sets free. The world is open in a new manner. The healed person can go his/her way, without any further interference of the Other who made ill and without further interference the healer who set free. The healer does not have a say over the life of the healed person.

Nevertheless, life is complicated, for all of us and thus often for people, who are on the way of healing, as well. Healing seldom is a total instantaneous happening. Healing often is a way to go, in a new and growing freedom. In that case the healer can seek, in the open and free relationship with the person on the way of healing, ways to go, again more out of the dark into brighter light. Here again however the decisions always are those of the healing person, never of the healer. His authority never can become power.

There are many examples for the steps which can be done: To ask for forgiveness, to put relationships and responsibilities right, to break off relationships etc.

In the end, being healed as well as being a healer, always is a gift. In old Biblical language, it is grace. We never can be proud. We only can be grateful.

Healing must be accepted. To be healed finally always is the responsibility of the ill person.

